



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

42

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/057,749

04/09/98

STRANDBERG

M

DAVOX-144XX

DANIEL J BOURQUE
835 HANOVER STREET
SUITE 303
MANCHESTER NH 03104

LM01/0315

EXAMINER

TIEU, B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2742

DATE MAILED:

03/15/00

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/057,749

Applicant(s)
Strandberg

Examiner
Benny Quoc Tieu

Group Art Unit
2742



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb 10, 2000

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-14 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-14 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2742

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to claim 1, the phrase “substantially immediately redial” on line 33 is confusing and is not supported in specification. For examination purposes, examiner assumes it is a periodically redial, e.g. redial every one minute, for example.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 1, 3-6, and 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bateman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,884,032) in view of Grossman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,436,965) and Srinivasan (U.S. Patent No. 5,185,782).

Regarding claims 1 and 10, Bateman teaches a system and method for providing a telephone call back to a customer with a computer equipment who uses WWW servers (computer network) to access information from an organizations databases, then needs help from a human

Art Unit: 2742

ACD agent, and requests for a callback (Abstract). Bateman fails to teach an automated dialer system including a call back campaign manager, a call scheduler, and a predictive dialer.

However, these features are well known in the art and taught by Grossman. Grossman teaches a call record scheduling system and method including outbound telephone contact campaigns (Abstract), a call scheduler (column 2, lines 56-61), and predictive dialer (column 4, lines 7-12).

Both Bateman and Grossman fail to teach redialing a busy telephone number. However, Srinivasan teaches a system and method wherein if a call does not get through, the arrangement repeatedly periodically repeats placing of the outgoing call (redial), until the call gets through (Abstract, lines 14-16). Since Bateman, Grossman, as well as Srinivasan teach the system and method concerning a call center, they could be combined by a skilled person in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of call scheduler, predictive dialer as taught by Grossman, and the use of redial as taught by Srinivasan into the system and method as disclosed by Bateman in order to allow a customer using a data network to be called back by an available agent of a call center, and in case the line of the customer is busy, the call is redialed until the call is answered by the customer. It should be noticed that Bateman teaches the network including the feature that a telephone line used to access a computer network is the same telephone line which is used for call back purpose (column 6, line 66 to column 7, line 13 and column 10, lines 55-58). Also, an option of immediately call back is described (column 6, lines 23-25 and column 7, lines 51-54).

Art Unit: 2742

Regarding claim 3, Bateman further teaches the computer network interface interfaces the computer network to agent terminals connected to the automated dialer system (Fig. 1).

Regarding claim 4, see Bateman, column 6, lines 15-30.

Regarding claim 5, see Bateman, column 6, line 24.

Regarding claim 6, see Bateman, column 7, lines 43-61.

Regarding claims 8 and 9, Bateman fails to teach the call back data is transmitted over a global computer network using a CGI script or a JAVA language script. However, this is a design choice and lies fully under a capability of a person skill in the art.

Regarding claims 11 and 13, Bateman fails to teach the method wherein the step of redialing includes continuously redialing the at least one of telephone numbers until an answer is detected. However, Srinivasan teaches this feature (Abstract, lines 14-16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of redialing as taught by Srinivasan into the method as disclosed by Bateman in order to offer the customer a call back service successfully.

Regarding claim 12, see Bateman, column 6, lines 55-57.

Regarding claim 14, Bateman further teaches the method wherein the call back data includes at least one time to be called back, wherein at least one of the telephone numbers is scheduled according to the time to call back (column 6, lines 23-25).

Art Unit: 2742

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bateman et al. in view of Grossman et al. and Srinivasan as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Szlam et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,828,731).

Regarding claim 2, Bateman, Grossman, and Srinivasan fails to teach the system wherein the predictive dialer includes a call pacer that paces dialing of the telephone numbers according to a call pacing algorithm. However, Szlam teaches an apparatus for non-offensive termination of an outbound call wherein the call pacing algorithm be adjusted to err on the side of calling too many parties rather than too few parties in order to maximize the utility of the agents. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of pacing algorithm as taught by Szlam into the system as disclosed by Bateman, Grossman, and Srinivasan in order to maximize the utility of the agents.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed February 10, 2000 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claims 1 and 10 are not clear enough to clarify the applicant's invention as argued by Applicant on pages 6-8. For example, the Applicant's invention (as described on page 7) provides a redial process to a telephone number of a telephone line used to connect to the network when the telephone line is busy. However, in claim 1, the claimed language shows "redial a **busy telephone number**" which is clearly NOT the telephone number of the telephone line.

Art Unit: 2742

Regarding to arguments on second paragraph from the bottom of page 8, Applicant states that Bateman requires at least two communications lines for simultaneous voice and data connections. Examiner disagrees with Applicant at this point. Bateman, at least for one case, teaches that voice and data can be transmitted over the same telephone line (column 6, line 66 to column 7, line 13 and column 10, lines 55-58).

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2742

7. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Box AF

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-6306, (for formal communications intended for entry, please label the response "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE")

Or: (703)308-6296, (for informal or draft communication, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")


Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **BENNY Q. TIEU** whose telephone number is **(703) 305-2360**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:00AM to 5:30PM.

The fax number for this Group is (703) 308-9051.


Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Patent Examiner: BENNY QUOC TIEU



Date: March 10, 2000.

Art Unit: 2742



**KRISTA ZELE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2700**